

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

CONFIDENTIAL AND PRIVILEGED

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERPerkins
Coie1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
PHONE: 206.359.8000
FAX: 206.359.9000
www.perkinscoie.com

If there are any problems with this transmission, please call:

AUG 12 2005

- ☒ Central Fax Room: 206 359-8575 ☐ *Sender's name and phone number
☐ Galland Reception: 206 359-8000
☐ Individual Floor:

DATE: August 12, 2005 COVER SHEET & 2 PAGE(S)CLIENT NUMBER: 10194-8058-000000RETURN TO: (NAME) Lana Anthony (EXT.) 3920 (ROOM NO.) 4111ORIGINAL DOCUMENT(S) WILL BE: ☐ SENT TO YOU ☒ HELD IN OUR FILES

SENDER:	TELEPHONE:	FACSIMILE:
Christopher J. Daley-Watson	(206) 359-3599	(206) 359-4599

RECIPIENT:	COMPANY:	TELEPHONE:	FACSIMILE:
Duc Nguyen, Primary Examiner [Art Unit 2643]	USPTO	(571) 272-7503	(571) 273-8300

RE: AGENDA FOR TELEPHONE CONFERENCE REGARDING APPLICATION NO. 09/665,780
 [Subscription-Based Billing Methods and Systems for Shared Network Modem Pools] ON AUGUST 16, 2005

This Fax contains confidential, privileged information intended only for the intended addressee. Do not read, copy or disseminate it unless you are the intended addressee. If you have received this Fax in error, please email it back to the sender at perkinscoie.com and delete it from your system or call us (collect) immediately at 206.359.8575, and mail the original Fax to Perkins Coie LLP, 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800, Seattle, WA 98101-3099.

ANCHORAGE • BEIJING • BELLEVUE • BOISE • CHICAGO • DENVER • LOS ANGELES
 MENLO PARK • OLYMPIA • PHOENIX • PORTLAND • SAN FRANCISCO • SEATTLE • WASHINGTON, D.C.
 Perkins Coie LLP and Affiliates



August 12, 2005

TO: Examiner Duc Nguyen
FROM: Christopher J. Daley-Watson
RE: **AGENDA FOR TELEPHONE CONFERENCE REGARDING
APPLICATION NO. 09/665,780 [Subscription-Based Billing
Methods and Systems for Shared Network Modem Pools] ON
AUGUST 16, 2005**

Examiner Nguyen, thank you for agreeing to have a telephone interview on August 16, 2005, 1:00 Eastern Time, regarding the above application. During the interview, I wish to address the following points:

1. The newly cited reference Schessel (US Patent No. 6,304,566) is directed to a central office configuration, rather than a shared local access network structure for allowing multiple subscribers to access a public telephony network. The applicant's system is used before accessing a public telephony network, indeed, before contacting, for example, the central office of Schessel.
2. Schessel fails to disclose "receiving a request . . . to place a telephone call through the shared modem to a public telephone network . . . wherein the shared local access network and shared modem pool together provide shared access to the public telephone network." Instead, the shared modem pool provides access to the ISP. In other words, the modem pool is at the opposite end of the connection, and not associated with the user originating the call to the ISP.
3. Schessel fails to disclose that "the telephone call placed through the shared modem pool to the public telephone network includes the user's telephone number in addition to, or in lieu of, any telephone number associated with the shared modem pool." Again, Schessel discloses the modem pool at an opposite end of the user's connection, namely at the ISP. This modem pool would not include the "user's telephone number." Possibly more importantly, Schessel discloses only providing a single telephone number, namely an E.164 number. This number is associated with the subscriber. There is no discussion of the problem, let alone the solution, to the subscriber's number

being lost when calls are made outbound to the network via a modem pool having their own modem phone numbers. Indeed, Schessel notes that the local area network (LAN) can access an ISP with "a direct leased line." Such a leased line may often have associated with it a single telephone number, or numbers of equipment connecting the LAN to the leased line. This number or numbers would be provided to the central office, as opposed to any subscriber numbers associated with users connected to the LAN. Schessel fails to disclose "encapsulating" a subscriber's phone number in a transmission made over a LAN, where equipment between the LAN and the PSTN/Central Office (CO) has its own phone number that is received by the CO.

Other distinctions exist, but the above points outline a good starting place for our discussions.

Again, thank you in advance for the telephonic interview.

-Christopher Daley-Watson

Reg. No. 34,807

Perkins Coie LLP

1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800

Seattle, WA 98101-3099

Tel: (206) 359-3599

Fax: (206) 359-4599

Cell: (206) 465-1416

CDaleyWatson@PerkinsCoie.com